UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

John Haynes Holmes
Editor in Chief

Louis L. Mann
Curtis W. Reese
Associate Editors

When God Walked in Geneva

By SYDNEY STRONG

Why Be Moral?

By JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

Miss Christabel Pankhurst, Adventist

By HARRY TAYLOR

VOLUME CX NUMBER 18

Chicago, January 16, 1933

PRICE TEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

Published Weekly October to June — *Subscription $3.00*
Published Bi-Weekly July to September — *Single Copies 10 cents*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, July 30, 1931, at the Post office at Chicago. Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor in Chief*
LOUIS L. MANN, CURTIS W. REESE, *Associate Editors*

Board of Directors
MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON, Treasurer
MRS. ELLA R. NAGELY
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. E. E. SMITH
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
Secretary: MAY JOHNSON

Editorial Board
W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors
LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Editorial Contributors
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
PERCY M. DAWSON
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
M. C. OTTO
FREDERICK STARR
JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND
JAMES H. WEST

Foreign Representatives
AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
CANADA—NORMAN STEWART DOWD
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

	Page
EDITORIAL—	
Notes	275
When God Walked in Geneva—SYDNEY STRONG	277
Jottings—J. H. H.	278
ARTICLES—	
Why Be Moral?—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES	279
Miss Christabel Pankhurst, Adventist—HARRY TAYLOR	283
POETRY—	
Selected—*Don Marquis*	275
"Let My People Go"—JEANNETTE TOMKINS	278
Lest Ye Be Judged—M. DECANTILLON STILLMAN	284
THE STUDY TABLE—	
Experiencing the Supernatural—MAYNARD SHIPLEY	285
A Chapter of History—LUCIA AMES MEAD	285
The Progressive Era—ROBERT C. SCHALLER	286
CORRESPONDENCE—	
From Tom Mooney	287
A Friend in France—Y. DECROIX	287
UNITY's Value—J. W. B.	287
THE FIELD—	
Message from Romain Rolland to the Conference of the International Committee on India	274
The New Social Creed of the Churches	287
Celebrating the Anniversary of the Landing of William Penn	288

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Message from Romain Rolland

To the Conference of the International Committee on India

(October 6th, 1932)

The Christ of India

The cause of India is not merely that of a great nation—a human continent—the common source of the languages and ideas of Europe, the original root from which have sprung the strong and varied trees of our European civilizations. We are not merely filially interested in its destinies, its awakening, its desire for independence. So many other peoples are being shaken by this legitimate spirit of revolt, and are asserting their right to guide their own destinies! One may say that, all over the world, over the tombs where the ancient nations have been lying in chains, a breath has passed, a summons: *"Lazarus, arise!* . . .

But of all the nations, the exceptional fact about the awakening of India—which outside of all reason or political passion has made its cause our own—is not so much the aim which India is pursuing; the self-government of a great people, or a United States of Indian races and peoples; it is rather the *means* which it employs in pursuing this aim; its active spirit; its mission; the holy man who embodies it; the *Mahatma* of Non-Violence—Gandhi, the hero and saint of the *Satyagraha.*

He has come in the blackest hour of history, when the principles by which the Western civilizations were upheld have been undermined. The tottering European world is giving itself up to the old, unrestrained animal instincts, served by all the destructive means offered by advanced science. Immediately after a frightful war of four years, and on the threshold, not of a war, but of ten interdependent wars which will not leave a single neutral state—surrounded by these menaces, as it were between the waves of the Red Sea towering up on either side and ready to fall down and engulf humanity, sits the frail sage of India, the second Buddha. He is alone, and by the mere fact of his non-participation, calm, inflexible, even to death, he commands the respect of brute force. This old man has merely to threaten to fast unto death, and the proudest Empire is forced to its knees—a victory which years of fighting would not have achieved; for all armed victories bring death and undying bitterness. For the first time the European world has been given an actual example, by this St. Thomas who believes nothing but facts, a triumphant example of what Gandhi himself has called *"the sword of self-sacrifice."* For the first time, Gandhi has made this triumphant experience, in his own eyes and in the eyes of the whole world, an experience which he has been maintaining in theory since 1920. He has rediscovered on a large scale this experience of the *Rishis,* of whom he has said that *"in discovering*

(*Continued on page* 287)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CX MONDAY, JANUARY 16, 1933 Number 18

As the skull of man grows broader,
So do his creeds,
And the gods they are shaped in his image,
And mirror his needs,
And he clothes them with thunders and beauty,
He clothes them with music and fire,
Seeing not, as he bows by their altars,
That he worships his own desire,
And mixed with his trust there is terror,
And mixed with his madness is ruth,
And every man grovels in error,
Yet every man glimpses a truth.

For all the creeds are false, and all the creeds are true,
And low at the shrines where my brothers bow, there will I bow too,
For no form of a god, no fashion
Man has made in his desperate passion
But is worthy some worship of mine,
Not too hot with a gross belief,
Nor yet too cold with pride,
I will bow down where my brothers bow,
Humble, but open-eyed.

—Don Marquis.

The report of President Hoover's Research Committee on Social Trends should set some people thinking. When a Committee of this character, financed by the Rockefeller Foundation, warns of the imminence of violent revolution, it would seem to be time to pause and ponder. The Committee refuses to "assume an attitude of alarmist irresponsibility," but its members insist that they would be "highly negligent" if they attempted to "ignore imminent perils in further advance of our heavy technical machinery over crumbling roads and shaking bridges." There "can be no assurance that violent revolution" in America can be averted "unless there can be a more impressive integration of social skills and fusing of social purposes than is revealed in present trends." The Committee emphasizes "the stark and bitter realities of the social situation," and speaks of the "dark periods of serious repression of libertarian and democratic forms" which would follow the outbreak of force and violence. This is amazing talk for America, especially in an official document bearing the imprimatur of the White House. But just for this reason is it significant. And perhaps it is no accident that at this same moment there should appear a book which looks in this same direction. We refer to Reinhold Niebuhr's "Moral Man and Immoral Society," which we hope to review in due course in these columns. Dr. Niebuhr is the ablest of our younger religious thinkers and this volume the most important which has come from his pen. He is rigorous, relentless, in his argument. He sees society moving swiftly toward a crisis inherent in the failure of our social institutions to embody and realize the ideals already attained by the individual. Education cannot forestall this crisis, religion cannot control and direct its outcome. It is essentially a pitting of power against power, of the mounting strength of the proletariat against the intrenched strength of privilege. Force, in other words, must be the agency of deliverance—perhaps political force, conceivably Gandhi's non-violent force, but in the last analysis the force of sheer physical onslaught. This means of course violent revolution, with all the fearful cost which Niebuhr himself well recognizes. Trends are ominous. Is this the destined end of our American adventure?

It is amazing that a man who is shelterless and starving should have to prove his respectability before he can be given relief. It would seem as though the mere fact that such a man has no food and no bed would entitle him to help. But in all our public agencies today interminable questions must be asked, interminable investigations held, interminable humiliations imposed, before aid is given to the unemployed. All this, of course, to catch the sinner and find the saint! But is the sinner to be left to perish? Shall we deny him the help we would give to any dying cat in the gutter? Was it thus that Jesus was accustomed to distinguish between men? And why should the saint be the only one to be assisted in times like these? What has happened to the nation is a vast calamity, like a pestilence or natural convulsion. This disaster has itself made no attempt to spare the saint and smite the sinner. On the contrary, just like the sun and the rain of which Jesus spoke as falling alike on the evil and on the good, this dreadful depression of our days has swept all men into its darkness. In times when there are plenty of jobs for those who would work, we can see a certain justice, nor to say practical wisdom, in attempting to administer charity on a basis of character. But in a period like this, it is as abominable as it is impossible. The masses of the unemployed today in this country should be handled exactly as the masses of the war refugees in Belgium were handled, or the masses of the famine-stricken in post-war Rus-

sia. Of course, the reason why they are not being so handled is not because the relief agencies are inhumane, but because they are inadequately provided with funds. In spite of the millions of dollars which have been raised to care for the unemployed this winter, there is not a social bureau or charity committee in the country which has enough money properly to do its work. Having only limited funds to meet unlimited distress, the harried workers put up all kinds of barriers to enable their money to last a little longer. Its a cruel business, for which the federal government, in its blind refusal to organize and sustain relief on a national and official basis, is fundamentally responsible.

Anything to avoid extending increased taxation into the upper brackets of the income tax scale—this is the one passion of the rich today in America! The government obviously needs money. The place to get it would seem to be the place where it is. If a man wants shoes, he goes to a shoe-store; if he wants music, he goes to a concert; if he wants company, he goes into society. In the same way, if he wants money, he goes, or would be wise to go, to the possessors of money —namely, the wealthy. But the wealthy have no intention of sharing their spoils, not even with the nation in its hour of need. Hence their determination to prevent any extension of the income tax into the regions where they dwell! This is the secret of the unbounded enthusiasm of these people and their mouthpieces for the legalizing of beer. They are not interested in *beer;* champagne and whiskey are the only drinks which will stir their jaded palates! But they are tremendously interested in taxing beer which will be drunk by the common people—and what are the people here for if not to pay taxes? This same determination explains the persistent drive for the sales tax. Never was there a better tax devised for putting most of the burden of public support upon the poor instead of upon the rich, and of course therefore all the mighty men and their puppet politicians are for it. All honor to President-elect Roosevelt that he has set his face against the outrage, and thus made the sales-tax impossible for the period of his administration at least. If this is the brand of Rooseveltian liberalism, let's have some more of it! Of course the budget balancing business would be easy, if special privileges were not to be protected. Cut out the $400,000,000 paid the war veterans who never crossed the seas, and raise the income taxes, and the thing would be done.

There are great advantages in dictatorships. There certainly are! Here is this recent decree of Mussolini, for example. According to the press reports of a fortnight ago, "Il Duce" has established a program for the curbing of "exuberant branches of industry without which the crisis cannot be overcome." Without which, we might add, our civilization cannot endure! The essential feature of the program is the provision that no plant in any line of manufacture may be built or enlarged without the government's consent. "Irregular industrial expansions dictated rather by bankers' than by manufacturers' standards," says the Fascist leader, "cannot be permitted." In other words, there must be order, not anarchy, in the processes of trade. We are just beginning to learn this here in the United States as one of the results of the great depression. For if anything is plain it is that a basic condition of the survival of our civilization is a planned economy. What got us into the present mess? Many things—primarily the War! But deeply involved in the whole debacle was the wild disorder of the "boom" period. Not an industry but what expanded like an inflated balloon! Not a factory but what built annexes and extensions as though there were no end to trade! Into every business making large profits rushed capital beyond all possibility of absorption. Of course in the end the explosion came. No such mountain of credit could be indefinitely sustained. Yet this same disastrous experience will be repeated if ever prosperity comes 'round that corner. Let any industry begin modestly to make money today, and immediately enough capital will pour into that industry to swamp it. What we must do is to bring order out of chaos in our economic life by authority of government. Our production must be planned, directed, controlled. No business must be allowed to expand unless there is a market for its goods—i. e., a consumption need. This policy means a complete change in our social philosophy and public policy. It will come hard in our democracy. Yet the way has at least been opened by Judge Brandeis' minority opinion in the Oklahoma ice case.

It is just as well to remind ourselves every now and then that the Russian government is dealing with the same type of material which is found in every other part of the world—namely, nature and human nature. In the working out of the famous Five-Year Plan, the Bolsheviki are wrestling with the native substance of this old earth, as stubborn today as it was in the day of Adam; and the tools at their disposal are fundamentally the hands and brains of men, in this case a peculiarly primitive and stubborn variety of man. Everything that is done must be done within the limitations of these elementary facts. This means, on the one hand, that the Soviets are achieving miracles. Take a typical *moujik;* add to him a dark stretch of Russian steppe; add to these a modern machine imported from abroad. From such a combination, how much can be safely and swiftly wrought? Not much, one would say! Yet in the great drive since 1928 have the Russians achieved what has never been even approached in any similar period of time. But, on the other hand, there are limits to accomplishment. The Bolsheviki

may seem to have wrought miracles—yet is the age of miracles forever gone. What is now done is done with men—in Russia, peculiarly stupid, brutal, and untrained men. That such men, even under the best conditions, to say nothing of the worst, should register in so vast an undertaking as the Five-Year Plan a considerable proportion of failure is simply inevitable. Hence the foolishness of saying that the Plan, at this stage of evolution, is either a perfect success or an utter failure. It is of course a mingling of both—stupendous achievement, tangled up with much bungling and disappointment. But the main thing is that the Russian people, under heroic leadership, have labored with devotion and utter sacrifice to put through a task as disproportionate to their powers as the work of Gulliver to the Lilliputians, and have actually done what no man thought possible in the beginning. Many and serious lapses look insignificant before such gigantic deeds.

Every year the holiday gatherings of the scientists get gayer with wild hypotheses and madder with lunatic speculations. The comparison of these scientists with the medieval theologians is inevitable. Take the sensational debate, for example, between Prof. Arthur H. Compton, of the University of Chicago, and Prof. Robert A. Millikin, of the California Institute of Technology, on the nature of cosmic rays. One alert newspaper reporter declared that no such debate had been held since the medievalists disputed over the momentous question as to how many angels could dance on the point of a needle. The data presented by the professors was as unreal, and the conclusions drawn therefrom as fantastic, as any ever handled by the theologians. Careful reading of the discussions at these recent meetings of the learned societies shows several things. First, the scientists know nothing, precisely as the medieval theologians knew nothing. Secondly, to cover up their ignorance, and to adorn it, the scientists invent theories every whit as extravagant as any that ever abode in a medieval school-room. Atoms, ions, electrons, etc., are the modern equivalents of angels, demons, and seraphim. Thirdly, the scientists today are as dogmatic as ever were the schoolmen. In their famous debate, both Compton and Millikin were dead sure they were right, though they presented diametrically opposite conclusions from data that met at no single point, and belabored one another with arrogant cocksureness. "There was obvious coolness between the two men," says the New York *Times*, "after the debate was over." What our scientists would do if they had in their hands the weapons of persecution, is an interesting speculation. What is evident from all this is that human nature does not change from age to age. Men must still have their fairy-tales, and still battle for them as children battle for toys. Our scientists today are our theologians. Science is the latest superstition of history.

When God Walked in Geneva

God is the Universal Power whose judgment all must face. God is Justice. I add God is Love—that power that like the sun gives life and destroys life.

I have watched this God, judge of the nations—which are as but a drop in a bucket—as he has walked and talked in Geneva in 1932. He is a God of Peace. He hates the murderer of his brother. He has watched the Peace Conference of the nations, whose purpose is to diminish and abolish their deadly weapons. He has been walking about Geneva, sitting on the platform, hovering over the press and observing from the visitors' gallery. He knows the mind of Drummond, of Benes, of Henderson. The purposes, plans, plots of all are known to him. He smiles, laughs, weeps—and a great sorrow often sweeps over his heart. He knows all inmost thoughts. There are for him no private seances.

The Almighty One—who knows Egypt, Nineveh and Babylon—has been walking in Geneva. The God of Justice and Peace has often been sorely disappointed.

The ministers of the nations have either disobeyed the heavenly vision or their war-warped minds have not listened, or had not the will to act.

1. The God of Peace spoke aloud the first week of the great Conference. It was February 6th. The delegates were all there. The galleries were filled with visitors from all lands. Several hundred press men were waiting with raised pencils. For three hours the people of the world spoke—young men, young women, former soldiers, churchmen of many sects, workers. Every continent had a representative. It was a united appeal to the assembled delegates—*give us peace in our time*. Great rolls of petitions were carried into the hall, representing the millions of mankind, all calling for the abolition of war, for the reduction of arms of slaughter.

The God of Peace spoke then. It was the time for action. Postponement was failure.

2. Three months passed by. There was much marching up and down the hill—in committees, bureaus, sub-committees, calling in of experts. A day was set apart. God came close to Geneva—closer than at any time since. The only concrete proposal was made by Litvinoff of the Soviets. It was very "drastic"—the thing that many speakers had before declared they favored. It was a rare proposition. It would have meant real disarmament. In fact, the proponent declared that he really stood for total disarmament. God

was interested in this proposal. The angels were all tuning up for a chorus. If Litvinoff had been Grandi, or Boncour, or Simon, or Benes, a tremendous peace stride would have been taken that day. Such a pity, that men permit prejudice to curse them and the world with them! The proposal was killed with laughing gas—God passed on in sadness.

3. When Einstein and Ponsonby came to town a short time afterwards, the God of Peace was interested. They came and went like the wise men of old, but not until they had left a divine message behind with the newspaper men. This eminent scientist and this one-time page to Queen Victoria were unable to see a way to peace except by the way of total disarmament at once.

4. God came again and spoke to Geneva from over the ocean. The Conference had reached an impasse. Summer was approaching. Delegates were engaged in telling of "quantitative" and "qualitative disarmament," were chasing bacteria, and discussing the method of procedure in consideration of poison gas—when, behold the "Hoover Proposals" burst upon the scene! These were concrete. They were drastic. They would have made a real step in disarmament. God was speaking in them—no doubt of it. They were a sincere proposition, and would have started world disarmament. But they were lavishly praised, chloroformed, and laid in cold storage by the most skillful diplomatic undertakers in creation. God, who is the God of the living, went away! He has not come back. A big sign was put up: "Summer Time." *And note well*—It was when the Hoover Proposals were side-tracked, *that Germany left Geneva.* What a pity—a third or a quarter reduction rejected.

A year of failures has closed. Are men to be mocked again with promises? God says, Away with your promises—they nauseate me. *I demand action!*

SYDNEY STRONG.

Jottings

Famous dead who passed away in 1932 after our recent report was prepared include the following: HENRY LANE WILSON, American diplomat; NORMAN E. MACK, Democratic politician; MAX ROGERS, comedian; MALCOLM D. WHITMAN, tennis champion; HIKOICHI MOTOYAMA, leading Japanese publisher; and HENRY L. SOUTHWICK, head of the Emerson School of Oratory, Boston.

We do not wonder that the New Year's celebrations were hilarious this year. Think of the joy of getting rid of 1932!

It cost the city of New York $34,026 to get rid of Mayor Walker. Cheap at the money!

Radio City, the most wanton waste of the age, is now getting under way in New York. The largest office building in the world is opening in a city where a third of the already available office space is empty. The largest theatre in the world is opening in a city where half the present theatres are closed. The largest broadcasting studios in the world are opening in a city already over-supplied with studios. This is America's idea of progress, and an idle millionaire's conception of public service.

This is a curious idea some Republicans have of Herbert Hoover's "return from Palo Alto" in 1936. If they are thinking of the June convention of that year in terms of Elba, then the campaign must be thought of as "the hundred days," and election day as "Waterloo."

"Jeanne d'Arc—the second most famous woman in all history."

William Lyon Phelps, in *Scribner's Magazine* (January). Who is the first?

J. H. H.

"Let My People Go"

(To Mahatma Gandhi, on his return to India, 1932.)

O Rebel Saint! You know too well
Rebellion means, to die!
The blood of martyrs rims like gems
The steps of tyranny.
O save that voice!
—"If I were still,
The very stones would cry."

Then, fragile Saint! What strength was yours,
Incredibly to go
Across the world, to face unarmed
The fanged and snarling foe—
What steeled you for the bullet blows—
The cell?
—"The love I owe."

But gentle Saint, must you lead out
The innocent to fall?
Are there no engines but their breasts
To breach that fiery wall?
—"They die, that millions, dying,
May hear the rescue call."

O mighty Saint—what promise
Of conquest can you give,
In face of death—disaster—
Defeat—yes, while you live!
—"Truth, by these words victorious,
Love! Suffer! and Forgive!"

JEANNETTE TOMKINS.

Why Be Moral?*

It is obvious that the answer to this question depends upon what we mean by being moral. There are certain aspects of morality to which there can be no conceivable objection, to put it mildly. We all rejoice in them, and are faithful to them. But our question would not have been raised, even in this cynical and sophisticated age, had there not been certain other aspects of morality which are doubtful. I propose, therefore, to take up this general problem of morality, and feel my way along, so to speak, from point to point, and see what is the reaction of our minds. I anticipate we shall not have very much difficulty in discovering where morality is sure, and where it is not so sure, at the present time.

The first aspect of morality which comes to mind is that which is suggested by the fundamental distinction between right and wrong. There may have been a time when men did not recognize this distinction. There may have been a time when they recognized it but were indifferent to it. But such a time, if it was ever here, has long since passed away. Men today are conscious of the right and of the obligation to do the right. They ask no questions and raise no doubts. They simply proceed, from this point of view, on the moral basis. Thus, in their relations with the world, they pass judgments of right and wrong, and praise the one and condemn the other. In their own lives, they seek to do what they regard as right; and, if they fail, and especially if they are found out, they are ashamed. On occasions they deliberately do wrong, but only because they believe that, under certain circumstances, and for certain ends, it is right to do wrong. They appeal, in other words, to a higher right to justify the wrong that they may do. Even when they question morality altogether, they do it in the name of some sociological dogma, or psychological technique, which to them is equivalent to morality. It all goes to show how completely, in general principle at least, men have moralized their lives. It is only when we come to apply the general principle to the specific act, to ask what is right in this case and what is wrong, that we have any trouble or dispute. For what is right to one man may be wrong to another, and vice versa. But that each man has his right, and feels the desire and the imperative to do it, is elementary in our existence. Even the criminal, who is an affront and peril to society, recognizes a law, or a code, which to him is right. No man, in other words, is willingly a wrong-doer in his own world and among his own associates. Which means, in essence, that man is a moral animal!

It would be interesting to inquire by what process man became this moral animal. The theologian would answer that man is a child of God, and thus heir to the divine spirit of all good. The philosopher would speak about the universe as pervaded by moral as well as physical laws, and declare that man had moralized his life as a condition of survival in such a world. The sociologist would talk about experience in society, and the lessons learned as a result of this experience. But to enter upon these theological and metaphysical disputes would lead us far astray. Our purpose at this point is to emphasize that there is a field of ethics—namely, the general field of right and wrong—where the moral life is as much taken for granted as the physical life. Whatever the reason, men are agreed that they should do the right and avoid the wrong. They no more think, in other words, of raising the question, why be moral, than of raising the question, why breathe. Morals may not be as simple as breathing, but they are as natural and inevitable. To stop one, as to stop the other, is to perish. This was the thought of Robert Browning as he looked upon the faces of the dead in the Paris morgue:

> It's wiser being good than bad,
> It's safer being meek than fierce;
> It's fitter being sane than mad.

A second aspect of morality, which immediately suggests itself, is that more concrete and vivid field which has to do with those inner qualities of the personal life which have come, through centuries of trial, to be accepted as standards of spiritual attainment. I refer, of course, to those fundamental virtues of the mind and heart which have adorned the saints, and have not been unknown to the men and women in our own experience whom we most admire. There is a type of character, in other words, which we all accept as ideal. However much we may dispute as to what is right and what is wrong, we agree that there are these inner elements of goodness which are transcendent. "When all is said," writes Maurice Maeterlinck, in his essay on *Our Anxious Morality,* "there is nothing to be changed in our old . . . ideals of justice, conscientiousness, courage, kindness, and honor." These are the qualities that seem to be distinctive of man in his best estate—not his reason, which may be shared in degree by the higher animals, but those inner qualities of soul, which seem to make him indeed to be but "a little lower than the angels." It is because we so reverence these qualities, and strive to emulate and exemplify them, that we bind them upon our hearts as a "code of honor," just as the Roman priests used to bind upon their brows the fillets of the gods. There are certain things, if I may so express it, which no gentleman will do. He will not be dirty in appearance, or unclean in speech; he will not lie, or cheat, or steal; he will not exploit a woman, or abuse a child; he will not oppress the weak, or toady to the strong; he will gladly "fall," like Wordsworth's happy warrior," rather than

> " . . . leave a dead, unprofitable name";

and he will be chivalrous at all costs to himself and to the world.

Some years ago a great steamship, the *Titanic,* sank suddenly in mid-ocean, under conditions of unforgettable horror. On this vessel were hundreds of men of great usefulness and reputation in the world. In any consideration of practical economy, it was important that these men, or some of them at least, should be saved. They were men whom, for various reasons, the world could ill afford to lose. But when the critical moment of life and death arrived, these men without exception stood aside, and let the lifeboats be filled with nameless women and feeble children. Surely, this was an extravagance! But mankind did not so regard it. On the contrary, the world applauded and was moved to gratitude and homage, because these men had remained faithful to the "code of honor." For better is it that a thousand men be lost, the best talents of a generation squandered, than the noble example of the strong dying for the weak should be denied. We can

*An address delivered at the Community Church, New York City.

spare the men, but not the code. The ideal of virtue, in other words, must be maintained. No man worthy of the name would disagree.†

So here, also, we are in accord. Our personal virtues have an intrinsic worth. Amid all the confusion of the moral life, there are some things that are sure; and among them is the abiding value of honesty, integrity, generosity, chivalry, and love. These qualities of manhood are not questioned any more. Wrought out of the stress and strain of agonizing struggle, they stand as the example of what "every man . . . should wish to be." Other standards may fall, other achievements crumble and disappear, but these higher virtues of the inner life, these rock-hewn elements of character, are destined to endure. If this is morality, as it surely is, then we do not ask any more, why be moral? We simply pray that we may know something of this morality which has glorified the noblest souls of every age.

This brings us to a third aspect of morality--the one, perhaps, which is most commonly in mind when we use the word. I refer to what I may call the social code, in contradistinction to the personal code of which we have just been speaking—a custom, or convention, or set of rules, "Thou shalt" and "Thou shalt not," which lays down the terms of conduct in our daily life. This type of morality is different from that which has to do with the fundamental distinction between right and wrong, since it not only emphasizes this distinction, but presumes to tell with authority, and in detail, what the right and wrong may be. This type is different, also, from that which has to do with the virtues of the inner life, since it is interested not in principles but in precepts. This morality is in effect a standard of conduct determined not by the intuitions of the soul but by the decrees of society. Such a standard may be as old as the Code of Hammurabi and the Laws of Manu, or as new as the latest rule of discipline in a Christian church. It may be as august as the Ten Commandments and the Golden Rule, or as trivial as a statute law or a decree of fashion. But in one way or another it is the pattern of men's lives. It is the only kind of morality that most people know anything about. We judge persons as moral or immoral, according as they conform, or do not conform. Yet it is just here that we encounter, for the first time, the doubts that are characteristic of our age. It is against these outward standards, traditions, conventions of the moral life that there is flung today the startling challenge, Why Be Moral?

At the outset, it is important to consider the nature of these social codes, and how they come into existence. Especially is it important to clear away certain serious misconceptions of their character. Thus, there is the tradition that many of these codes—the Ten Commandments, for example!—come from God, and therefore are imposed by the authority of the divine will. But intelligent people do not believe this any more! The Ten Commandments are not a sacred revelation, but a social deposit. They record not what God, or Jehovah, thought about the conduct of men for all time, but what the Jews of three or four thousand years ago thought about the conduct of men in their own time. The Commandments, in other words, are human, and derive all of their interest, importance, and authority from the obvious fact that they represent the judgments of generations of men upon the problems of the moral life. If these judgments came to be associated with the idea of God, it was because the Jews found them to be so precious, as the Christians later found the words of Jesus to be so sacred, that they inevitably ascribed them to that one source from which they devoutly believed came "every good and perfect gift." But this is a human, not a divine, process. It is a lesson in sociology, not in theology. If the Ten Commandments are to be criticized, or cast aside, it is not because they are superstitions, but because they represent an ancient stage in the evolution of a race.

Again, it is affirmed that these social codes are an arbitrary invention imposed upon man from without, and thus alien to his nature. Thus, the free thinker asserts that they are the invention of the priests who undertook thereby to enslave mankind to their devices. The social radical goes farther and declares that these codes are a class invention, conceived by the strong for the subjection and exploitation of the weak. The whole conception of morality is a bourgeois conspiracy against the proletariat! But this is bad history, and worse sociology. For these codes are not an invention of any particular group or class, but a discovery of men in general. Morality is not a law imposed by some wicked power, but a lesson learned by much hard experience. The historic codes, the established customs and conventions of society, are essentially a part of the life of man as it has been lived here on this earth, and thus a part of human nature. They are in essence the record of man's adventure, the testimony of his wisdom. If they have been written down and passed on, embodied in laws and institutions and sacred rites, it is not to enslave, but to guide and protect, the race. What men have learned through much trial and tribulation they would transmit to their children, and their children's children, that these in their turn may not go astray. In course of time these codes may need revision as antiquated, inadequate, mistaken, but we must reverence them still, for the life-blood that they contain.

Again, these social codes are frequently described, and therewith condemned, as systems of discipline, or repression, which hamper the normal development of the race. Their spirit is always the spirit of denial—"Thou shalt *not*—" and thus in practical effect a mechanism which binds man as in the fetters of a straitjacket. There is truth, of course, in this charge, at least to the extent that again and again there have come movements of too rigorous reform which have subdued men to the tyranny of iron laws. But such laws are not synonymous with these social traditions, which are the product not of a single and sudden episode of history, but of the long progress of the ages. A social code, or convention, is in its very essence an agent not of repression, but of liberation. If it represses at all, it is the selfish strength of the few, in the interest of the larger, freer, and fuller life of the many. For how did these codes come into existence—and why did they survive? Let us summarize all that they mean in a single statement!

In the beginning, man lived alone upon the earth. The world was wide, and he was able to move about and do as he pleased. His largest social unit was the family, or tribe, and this was easily controlled. But as time went on, the world became more crowded; cities grew, nations were formed. This brought to man the problem of living together on a wide and complex scale of social relationship; and this, in turn, created

†See Durant Drake's "Problems of Conduct," a valuable book in this discussion.

the necessity of rules, or laws, for the direction of the separate individual life in the interest of the common whole. Each man, of course, must be permitted to live his own life; but the freedom of this life must necessarily be limited by the freedom of the life which every other man was permitted to live. The individual, in other words, must conduct himself with due regard to the rights and privileges of his associates, which were equal with his own. It was from this necessity that men got their idea of "conduct" as the basis of morality; and of a code of conduct as the law, or custom, of the community. The whole thing was an attempt to organize life in such a way that a small sacrifice of freedom by each would result in a large accession of freedom by all.

Our contemporary experience with the automobile is a perfect parable of the origin and character of social codes. In the old days, when vehicles were few and slow, each man could drive much as he pleased. Then, almost without warning, came the automobile. Our streets were filled with speeding cars. Before long it was difficult for any car to move with any ease. In the end it seemed as though we were reaching a point where no car could move at all. We were in a tangle, which it was necessary to untangle. And the only way this could be done was to subordinate the rights of each single driver to the larger and more inclusive rights of all drivers together. The traffic, in other words, must be organized; and organization meant a code, a set of laws, based on the experience of the automobile in transit, which should become the rule of the road. These traffic laws, now everywhere established and obeyed, constitute the morals of automobile-driving. Only incidentally are they laws imposed from without; primarily they are agreements accepted from within. Only accidentally are they a repression of the individual; fundamentally they are a liberation of the community. We have voluntarily subjected ourselves as individuals to a minimum of interference, that as members of society we may escape a maximum of interference. This is a parable of social history. Our morals, as they have developed out of the past, says a distinguished teacher, are "codes of conduct which make for the preservation of life and happiness."

Now what are we going to say about these codes of conduct as standards of morals in our day and generation? Shall we be moral, in this conventional sense of the word? My answer to this question is simple and direct—that, other things being equal, *we should live in accordance with the code.* My reasons for this answer are as follows:

In the first place, I believe that the code is the cement, so to speak, which holds together the structure of society. Morality is absolutely necessary as a condition of social survival. I see only two alternatives in the problem of our common life as citizens of the state, and as men and women upon the earth. We can work out a system of organization, which will express itself as law and custom in the life of the community, and as morals in the life of the individual, and give to that system our allegiance, as the automobilist gives his allegiance to the system of red and green lights, or we can abandon organization, and return to the jungle where every man, like every beast, will care for himself as best he can. It is obvious that the latter alternative, which is social as well as moral anarchy, means the abandonment of everything that man has achieved through centuries of struggle for civilization. It is obvious, also, that it means the loss to each separate individual of all those higher qualities of gentleness, forbearance, compassion, honor, which have been attained at last as the richest rewards of manhood. But this abandonment of the code should be chiefly abhorrent, it seems to me, as involving the destruction of the weakest and most helpless among mankind. For in any break-up of society, in any abandonment of settled standards and practices of life, it is the weak and not the strong who invariably pay the price. So I would be moral for the sake of preserving society—that little of safety, justice, and liberty which man has managed to achieve. I would at least obey this code until I had found a better and truer code to establish in its place.

Secondly, I believe that obedience to the code is the easiest, safest, happiest, and most efficient way in which I can conduct the routine of my life. For the secret of successful living is very considerably that of reducing the largest possible area of action to automatic control. There are certain things which are important —the practice of my profession, the service of great causes, the love of my fellows. To these things I want to give the utmost of my body, mind, and will. There are a million other things—the multitudinous distractions of life, especially the mere routine of daily existence—which are not important, but which press upon me constantly. From these I desire to be delivered, that there may be no diversion of attention, and no loss of energy, from the main business of my days. But this can be done only by relegating these subordinate things to the realm of the automatic, or unconscious. This is where morals come in! For a code of conduct, among other things, is a method of making easy and simple the routine of our lives. Thus, there is the code of eating. Why should I not observe it, when long practice has proved that it is not only the decent and lovely way of consuming food, but also the easy and expeditious way? Again, there is the code of the clock—a certain established time for eating, sleeping, playing, and doing business. Why should I complicate my life, and the lives of innumerable other people, by refusing to hold myself punctual to the time-schedule of the world? Still again, there is the code of sex. When I have a dozen important things to do in life before I die, why should I deliberately get myself sexually involved with a variety of women? Women may be a lot of things, but certainly they are distracting. That is one reason for avoiding them. If you should ask me why I believe in the marriage code, and why I have scrupulously observed it, I could give you many reasons. One of them would be that I happen to adore my wife. Another would be that I believe that love is possible only between two persons in an exclusive and permanent relationship. And another certainly would be that I am ineffably relieved, and abundantly satisfied, to pass over my sex life to the care of a single woman, and thus get it safely out of the way. So the moral code makes for security, efficiency, happiness. Why complicate life when it can be made so simple and so easy?

Thirdly, I believe in morality because I believe in co-operation. When a man joins a football squad, it is naturally expected that he will observe the rules of the game. When he goes on to the field, the coach and his fellow-players take it for granted that he will heed the signals, run in the right direction, and get in the way of the opposition. When a worker becomes a member of a trade union, it is assumed that he will

obey the laws which have been won through years of suffering, sacrifice, and blood. He will work eight hours and not nine, accept the union wage and not less, and heed an order to go on strike. When a musician is received into an orchestra, he is expected to make harmony with his fellows. He will play his own part in the score, follow scrupulously the notes, and heed the baton of the conductor. These are parables of the life of man in society. We are playing a game—and morals are the rules. We are doing a work—and the code is the regulations. "We are the music-makers," as the poet has put it—and conduct is the conductor. The law of life, as of every part of life is cooperation. We must do what is expected by those with whom we have agreed to live. Morality, in other words, is the basis of fellowship.

Lastly, I would live in accordance with the moral code because I believe the chances are that the code is right. For this is no casual enactment of law and custom. It is no snap judgment of right and wrong. The morals of the race have been wrought out by the labors of the years. They have been tested by the trials of a hundred countries and a thousand centuries. It is amazing, the uniformity of the codes of history! They differ in a myriad ways; they reflect the varied influences of climate, soil, religion, social economy; but in essentials they are all the same. The Egyptian Book of the Dead, the Code of Hammurabi, the Wisdom of Confucius, the Path of Buddha, the Laws of Moses, the Beatitudes of Jesus—all extol the same virtues, enjoin the same duties, promise the same goods. For they are all at bottom sprung from the same source—the experience of man in reaction upon the universe! So, other things being equal, I trust these venerable codes. Unless I can be shown very definitely to the contrary, I believe I shall be right in walking with the ages.

But perhaps I *am* shown to the contrary! Then comes the supreme test of the moral life—when the conscience of the single man speaks out against the judgment of mankind. What am I to do when I become convinced, in my own despite, that, in the name of that higher morality which belongs to the inner soul, I must be disobedient to the morals of my time?

To this inquiry there can be but a single answer. I must of course be true to my own heart, for "out of the heart are the issues of life." It is thus only that humanity has progressed in morals as in other interests of life—through the stalwart testimony of the single man who has dared to discover wrong in what is universally reverenced as right, or to find right in what is universally condemned as wrong. For no social code is permanent, as no moral teaching is infallible. Inevitably experience moves on, and, like a river, deepens and widens to new shores.

> New occasions teach new duties, time
> makes ancient good uncouth;
> We must upward still and onward, who
> would keep abreast of truth.

So no convention of society, however long established, no code of conduct, however sacred in tradition, can stand against the testimony of the quickened soul that feels a fresh challenge to the right. But let him be cautious in his challenge! Let him "keep (his) heart with all diligence," says the proverb-writer. Above all, let him not think infallibility dwells with him. It is so easy to be misled! To every man, who would break with the moral standards of his time, I would address three questions as the test of his soundness and sincerity:

First, is this break of yours a matter of moral principle, or of personal indulgence? Are you seeking to establish a new code, or to satisfy an old appetite? How many are those who seek to cover a selfish passion with a proclamation of a changed morality! Like the corrupt politician who wraps his foul deeds in the flag of patriotism! In recent years, for example, America has been swarming with champions of liberty. These persons never served liberty before—in the dark days of the Great War, for example! But now that Prohibition is with us, they are ready to fight, and die, and even *drink* for liberty. What am I to think of these people? Are they really thinking about liberty, or do they simply want a drink? When I see a teetotaler denouncing the 18th Amendment, I take him seriously; but seldom a man who carries a pocket-flask, or haunts a speakeasy. In the same way, I find myself remembering an influential popular teacher of our day, who lived for years a perfectly conventional domestic life. He had his wife, his family, his home. Then, suddenly, he fell in love with his secretary, practiced with her adultery, and underwent divorce. Straightway this man discovered a new ethics of sex, and became an ardent disciple of freer relations between men and women. It may be he was sincere; but my own conviction is that his new morality was nothing in the world but an attempt to rationalize, or rather moralize, his dishonor. This same man, I may add, was a pacifist in war-time and went to prison for his faith. Here, in his sacrifice, was an evidence of principle, which I fail to find in the frank indulgence of his escapades in sex.

A second question I would ask is this—are you desirous that your present action in violation of the code shall become a part of the social code of the future? Are you willing, in other words, that what you do shall be done by other men as the morals of the race? More particularly, are you willing that years hence your children shall know about your deed and use it as an example for their lives? If so, then you can be reasonably sure that you are moved by loyalty to a higher morality which you would substitute for some "good custom" that you believe "corrupts the world." If not, then you may be perfectly sure that you are following an impulse which your heart itself rejects. Time is a great tester of reality. "I would define goodness," says Gerald Stanley Lee, "as doing what one would wish one had done in twenty years, twenty days, twenty minutes, according to the time the action takes to get ripe."

Lastly, I would ask this question—does your break with the moral code reveal a deeper and truer insight into life's meaning? Does it take us nearer to the inner core of reality? Does it clarify our thought and purify our will? Does it lift us as though to higher levels of vision and attainment? Jesus taught the significance of this inquiry in his attitude toward the Mosaic code. He was an innovator in his time. He was charged by the rigorists of Israel with gross and arrogant immoralities. He did not deny that he made free with the commandments of the Law. But he did not break them wantonly. "I come," said he, "not to destroy but to fulfil." And then he proceeded to show

what he meant. The old law decreed that a man should not "forswear" himself. "But I say unto you," said Jesus, "swear not at all." The old law forbade adultery. "But I say unto you," said Jesus, "that whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her, hath committed adultery." The old law declared, "Thou shalt not kill." "But I say unto you," said Jesus, "that whosoever is angry with his brother . . . shall be in danger of the judgment." Here was a new morality, and a new and more awful discipline. This is the note of every true reformer of morality. He lifts one higher, where the air is thin; he takes one farther, where the way is long. "Except your righteousness *exceed* the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye can in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven."

Such is my answer to our question, why be moral? After all, what *is* morality? It is the compass on the ship, needing constant correction, but always pointing the way. It is the balance-wheel in the watch, often inaccurate, but holding the mechanism true to itself. It is a jewel, often flawed and broken, but, if we discard it, we are "like the base Indian" who

> " . . . threw a pearl away
> Richer than all his tribe."

Maeterlinck finds our morality an "anxious" thing. He sees how constantly it must be altered and improved, and so sympathizes with the reformers. "But let them not pretend," he says, "that it is necessary to fling overboard, like a dangerous cargo, all that hitherto formed the heroic, cloud-tipped, indefatigable, adventurous energy of our conscience. . . . Our ideal no longer asks us to create saints, virgins, martyrs; but even though it take another road, the spirit that animated the saints must remain intact. . . . Those who assure us that the old moral ideal must disappear . . . are strangely mistaken. . . . We have only to draw nearer to it, to clasp it more closely, to realize it more effectively; and, before going beyond it, we have still a long and noble road to travel beneath the stars."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

Miss Christabel Pankhurst, Adventist

Some weeks ago I heard over the radio the familiar voice of Miss Christabel Pankhurst. She was speaking from the Advent Church in Portsmouth, N. H., and, apparently, proclaiming the Second Coming of Christ as the only solution for the world's difficulties.

My father and I had known the Pankhurst family in the early days of the "Votes for Women" campaign in England. Dad was one of the founders of the British Independent Labor Party and well liked by Mrs. Pankhurst and daughters when he took the chair at any of their meetings. The suffragists in Great Britain freely used the platform of the Socialist Party in the early days of their agitation and many of the leading socialists backed the women by every means in their power. As a very young socialist speaker I had from time to time taken the chair for Miss Pankhurst and her mother.

That voice over the radio revived many stirring memories for me. It brought back all the fire and fervor of the first days of the Socialist movement in England when with a religious zeal we proclaimed the early appearance of the Brotherhood of Man and the Federation of the World. Spite of the tragedy of the Great War, spite of the horrible aftermath, spite of our postponed dreams, I am still an earnest believer in the steady progress of mankind onward and upwards. I still believe in Man, in his innate divinity, his capacity for unending growth, his ultimate achievement of the "vision splendid."

My wife and I telegraphed to Miss Pankhurst immediately inviting her to stay at the parsonage for a week or two of rest in and between her tours. She very graciously accepted the invitation and we spent a very enjoyable week together while she took her ease and rested up.

Miss Pankhurst is one of the most brilliant of modern Englishwomen. She was one of the first women in England to become a fully qualified lawyer and she took her high honors at Owens College (now the University of Manchester, England). She is an omnivorous reader and has at her disposal an amazing amount of data and information concerning the political and religious life of our time. She is the author of three books on the Second Coming of Christ. She is a member of the Church of England and in background and general attitude far removed from the ordinary adventist of our day. She approaches the problem more from the standpoint of the statesman or politician than from that of the religious enthusiast. She must of necessity, being the Christabel Pankhurst of the old suffrage days, be capable of great fervor and enthusiasm, but it is the enthusiasm of a Henry George rather than that of a Moody.

When the war descended upon Great Britain the Suffragettes dropped their agitation and loyally co-operated with the government in the prosecution of the war. A few years previously the women suffragists had burned down the mansion of Mr. Lloyd George, but during the war they buried their differences and helped him all they could. Miss Pankhurst was never a pacifist and few of the suffragettes were pacifists either. Apart from the question of votes for women they were women, for the most part, of the conservative element in British political life.

After the war, Miss Pankhurst says, she was overwhelmed, disillusioned, dispirited, lost and bewildered. Like so many of us, she saw all her hopes and dreams and enthusiasms smashed to atoms by the catastrophe. She came over to this country and then it was, soon after the war, that she became interested in Bible prophecy. Diffidently, half-ashamed, as she herself says, she began to embrace the idea of the Second Coming of Christ as the only hope of a stricken world. Previously she had prided herself upon her capacity as a woman leader to help solve the world problems; she had thought of the Advent enthusiasts, whenever she had come in contact with them, as fanatics more or less out of touch with the real world of affairs.

But after the war her mind fixed itself upon Bible prophecy and with amazing dexterity she caught hold of all that it offered and fitted it in with conditions as she saw them developing. For example, there is a certain passage in the Book of Daniel that can be construed as referring to the Roman Empire. According to this reading the Roman Empire will be ruling the world in the last days. What more convincing

than that just at this very time Mussolini should be proclaiming the re-establishing of the Roman Empire.

It would take up too much space in this short article to elaborate all the arguments and aspects of world affairs that Miss Pankhurst brings forward as the fulfilment of Bible prophecy and as an indication that Christ is about to return in power and glory. Anyone who is interested in her arguments may purchase her books on the subject published by Harper and Brothers.

The old scholastics used to affirm that the very improbability of any dogma or belief was a great argument in its favor. Newman, the author of "Lead Kindly Light," had the same attitude. Poor reason is at best a weak reed upon which to lean and just as likely as not the thing that is unreasonable and incredible is the most likely to be correct.

I may be wrong in thinking that some such attitude of mind must lie back of Miss Pankhurst's acceptance of the Second Coming, but at any rate one can see that the acceptance of the idea in the first place was a terrifice wrench to her former intellectual conception of life. I admire her all the more for her courage and sincerity in thus turning her back completely upon her former way of thinking if by so doing she satisfies the deep urge within her for an adequate basis of faith.

She is not ignorant of any aspect of modern life. She reads and absorbs all the latest astronomical and scientific theories from any and every source. She has worked out for her own satisfaction a scientific basis for the whole facts of prophecy. Past, Present, and Future are possibly all one to the great I AM: to the Designer Infinite the future and the past may be as plainly writ as is the whole history of the last presidential campaign.

What then are my own reactions to this Adventist Gospel as proclaimed by its latest prophet? In the first place it seems to me that it is a gesture of despair, a sad admission that man as man is incapable of achieving his own salvation. Only by supernatural intervention can man be extricated from the awful mess in which he finds himself today. Man has not changed much, says Miss Pankhurst, since the day that he was created. (She has very little use for your theory of evolution; it is far saner and far more reasonable in her opinion to believe the account in the first chapters of the Bible.)

Man, she says, is still of the earth, earthy. Rub off the thin veneer and he is still a selfish brute unchanged and unredeemed. And all the signs point to the fact, she asserts, that he never *can* be redeemed by his own efforts. He is a lost and fallen creature unless God Himself returns to earth again to "make over" mankind.

It follows from this admission of man's inherent badness that Miss Pankhurst thinks that all human attempts at reform are futile and doomed to failure. Useless, she asserts, to attempt anything very ambitious in the way of human advancement even though the Second Coming be indefinitely prolonged. At the most she only advises us to stand behind the solid and conservative elements in our governments and help maintain as far as possible the status quo.

My second reaction to Miss Pankhurst's gospel is that it tacitly assumes that the Almighty has made a mistake in his first creation of mankind and that ultimately he will have to come again to rectify his own blunder and put mankind to rights. For what kind of "goodness" will it be when Christ returns in power and majesty to impose his will upon the world? Will it not be a "goodness" superimposed, inflicted like that of a parent who comes back suddenly to an unruly household and settles matters with a heavy hand? Will it not be the kind of mass hypnosis, an imposed perfection that works because it is achieved by a master mechanic placing inert cogs in their places?

"Goodness" is an achievement; it is not something that can be bestowed from the outside. By the very constitution of my nature even God himself cannot make me good.

I am jealous of my own capacity to attain inner harmony and of the capacity of mankind as a whole to achieve the Kingdom of God in all its splendor.

"We men of earth have here the stuff of paradise; we have enough . . . ."

Not for a moment do I assert that I or the human race can achieve goodness and perfection without God. I am a channel for his wisdom and his goodness, but I am convinced that it is through me and the rest of my fellows that God is working out his great scheme of perfection. It is not the return of one Christ that this world so deeply needs. Rather is it the advent of millions of christs. "Be ye redeemers. If ye redeem not, none shall deliver." Not until every man and every woman assumes the responsibility for the Christ-State; not until there is glowing within the breast of every man and every woman an enthusiasm for the Kingdom that *must* work itself out in human life; not until every man and every woman becomes another Christ will he come again in all his splendor.

To me, the lurement and glory of this appeal makes dim and faint and unreal, bizarre and unhuman the fervent message of Miss Pankhurst. I think of all the stricken fields in humanity's many battlefields that have so often been turned into glorious triumphs. I think of all the daring and self sacrifice and heroism and creative ability that have brought humanity thus far on its long trail upwards. And when I remember my human heritage and the many millions of human hearts that are still aching, the world over, to join in some great move onwards and upwards I thank God for the remnant that still remains who still believe in human perfectibility, in human worth, in human dignity and in human capacity and who are still eager to join hands and help, "Thy Kingdom come, and Thy will be done upon earth"—through us and through the generations yet unborn. Amen.

HARRY TAYLOR.

Lest Ye Be Judged

I visited a prison once
To teach them how to pray.
I bowed my head and spoke my words
And then I came away.

But something stirred my bigot soul,
Their eyes had questioned me.
Why were they penned in concrete walls
And I unjudged and free?

My soul was humbled into dust.
In trembling fear I trod
The crowded paths most people go
And hoped I'd pass with God.

M. DECANTILLON STILLMAN.

The Study Table

Experiencing the Supernatural

If, to paraphrase the Roman playwright, nothing human is alien to the human being, then those perplexing experiences, not yet correlated to known laws, which we call psychic or clairvoyant must also be naturalized into the citizenship of our thought. If only fools and clowns had reported such experiences, one might say categorically that with increasing culture and wisdom the liability to undergoing them decreased in exact ratio: this latest document* of the Boston Society for Psychic Research invalidates any such claim, for it is a report following a questionnaire sent to 10,016 persons selected, more or less at random, from "Who's Who in America." Of these, 2,263 answered that they had had no such experiences; 430 answered that they had had one or more, and described them.

The proportion may seem very small, though not to the practised questionnaire-sender; but it must be remembered, first, that doubtless very many of the 7,323 not replying at all had had such experiences, but preferred for one reason or another not to describe them, even anonymously; and second, that every one of these 430 was a man or woman above the average in intelligence and achievement, else he would not have been in "Who's Who" at all. By a series of exhaustive statistical comparisons, the editor showed that the educational status and professional opinion of those answering "yes" was at least as high as those of the persons answering "no"; that they were approximately of the same average age (not gullible, that is, because of senility); and that they were equally divided among various religious beliefs, so far as they had any.

We have a residue, then, of credible, hard-headed persons of more or less eminence, who in appreciable number are not afraid or ashamed to acknowledge that they have experienced, or heard from persons near to them and of proved credibility, phenomena of a sort usually considered as supernatural. The present volume covers the field of apparitions, monitory dreams, and premonitions. later bulletins will take up physical phenomena and other miscellaneous categories.

Many of these witnesses are scientists, some of whom permit the use of their distinguished names. But scientists, for various reasons pointed out by Dr. Prince in his introduction, are notoriously suspicious of and prejudiced against any possibility of the so-called supernatural. "It is a matter of common knowledge that such things are, in scientific circles, generally looked at askance. . . . The scientist, if he has not himself come into convincing contact with one, generally deems it incumbent to discount all testimonies that such facts have occurred. . . . The sample letters which we have given, evidence a clannish pride in the sciences which they represent being comparatively free (as supposed) from taint. Not one letter was received from a lawyer, clergyman, litterateur, journalist, artist, 'hard headed' business man, *et al.*, affirming the superior immunity of his class from superstition."

I feel that it is unfortunate that the very body of men most qualified to pass upon the validity of phenomena so frequently and credibly reported should be most eager not to inspect them. To refuse even to consider such reports plays into the hands of the enemies of science and the friends of superstition far more than would a willingness to investigate freely and frankly, without previous conviction for or against, any and all sincerely described experiences of mentally normal men and women. The more honor is due to the relatively few men of science who have superseded such prejudice. It matters comparatively little whether in the end so-called psychic phenomena are or are not proved to be natural physical phenomena hitherto unexplained; but I think it matters a great deal that trained scientists, particularly biologists and psychologists, should be fair and honest and unopinionated enough to be willing to test them as they would any other manifestations of this universe.

Here, in any event, is a new series of detailed experiences, some of them trivial, many startling. The book may be read merely as a fascinating volume of ghost-stories, some of them first-rate ones, or it may be considered as a case-book for present and future study. I prefer to regard it in the latter light, and that commits me to no definite opinion as to the causes or real nature of the phenomena described.

A word must be said of the careful, unbiased, competent editing of the book. No better person could be selected for such work than this experienced psychic researcher and liberal clergyman. He has scholarship, tact, lack of impressionability, and (that rarest of virtues in psychic research) a keen sense of humor. He has compiled a volume as fascinating as it is scientifically valuable.

MAYNARD SHIPLEY.

*"Human Experiences." By Walter Franklin Prince. Published by Boston Society for Psychic Research. $3.50.

A Chapter of History

In this masterly survey* of our World War history and what led to it, Professor Merle Eugene Curti, of Smith College, has made a contribution of permanent historical value. Like Allen's fascinating "Only Yesterday," it brings to remembrance a wealth of forgotten or generally unrecognized facts and mental attitudes. Few students of international affairs have given the intensive study and research in Washington archives that is evidenced in every page by copious footnotes. The book of 250 pages is not merely a compendium of facts but is a balanced interpretation of the tentative steps and more or less inconsistent positions taken by Secretary of State Bryan in the very delicate and difficult position in which he found himself during the fateful years between 1914 and 1917 and later, after his resignation when he still endeavored through voice and pen to deal with the chaotic situation so little understood at the time. We recall now that Sir Edward Grey, Asquith and Lloyd George themselves, as they all afterwards declared, were working more or less under misapprehensions. Lloyd George himself admitted that he had come to believe in 1920 that "no ruler had really wanted war, but that the nations had staggered and stumbled into it."

Bryan hoped to keep us out of war. In June, 1915, 70,000 endeavored to hear him when he spoke at the Madison Square Garden and told them how to keep out of war. He opposed the military preparedness advocated by Roosevelt and also Taft's newly

*Bryan and World Peace, by Merle Eugene Curti. Published by Department of History, Smith College.

organized League to Enforce Peace as the latter plan would provide "force to fight force." He would have had us act as a mediator; the violation of our neutral rights was like "brawlers unintentionally knocking down bystanders." It should always be remembered that these deplorable fatalities were not inflicted by Germany in hostility to ourselves but incidentally to war on the allies. Bryan thought that we should prevent our citizens from taking passage on ships of belligerents carrying contraband.

He appealed to the labor interests to mobilize public opinion for peace. He felt that the press drowned out the voice of the great peace-loving mass of citizens, in the effort of special groups to promote the martial spirit. He proposed government ownership and operation of munition and armament plants. He denounced loans from neutrals to belligerents and was as much afraid of helping one side as another, but he did not advocate an embargo on arms as he was strongly urged by German-American groups to do. He was offered five hundred dollars if he would include such a proposal in his speech. He advocated a referendum on peace or war, though this proposal had never been favored by the American Peace Movement. Anent these proposals Professor Curti says:

> Propaganda, inspired by desire for profit; loans to belligerents, committing us to their cause; an armament trust identifying patriotism with thirst for gold; privileged Americans insisting on travelling in Europe in *de luxe* cabins of belligerent vessels at the risks of endangering the lives of hundreds of thousands of humbler citizens in war; all these things were both relevant and fundamental. If his preventive measures seem less realistic, still they were worthy of trial. Who can say that investigation, delay, and patience might not have been effective? Taken all in all, Bryan's program was comprehensive and plausible.

Bryan was "more lyrical than logical" in his much condemned statement that a million men would spring to arms in a day if the call came. "What he meant of course, was that in case of actual invasion Americans would rise up *en masse* to defend their homes." The press picked out and ruthlessly ridiculed several similar statements, but "neglected to feature many of the wise and sensible arguments which he was making." Wilson's reelection was won "thanks in part to Bryan's persuasive appeals. . . Though he continued to oppose compulsory military service, a train of quick, dramatic events disheartened him in the fight he continued to wage against our entering the war." Bryan's appeal in December, 1916, was for a negotiated peace. He wrote to Lloyd George then:

> There is no dispute that must necessarily be settled by force. All international disputes are capable of adjustment by peaceful means. Every guarantee that can possibly be secured by war can be stated as a condition precedent to peace. Do not, I pray you, by refusing an exchange of views assume the responsibility for a continuation of the unspeakable horrors of this unparalleled conflict. Your decision may mean life or death to millions."

This was at once followed by Wilson's identic note to the powers 'assuming that there was no dispute which must be settled on the battlefield.'

After the new submarine policy of February, 1917, Bryan urged "postponement of outstanding issues until the European struggle was over; keeping Americans off belligerent ships; refusing clearance papers for American vessels carrying both passengers and contraband and if necessary, forbidding all American ships from entering the war zone." No machinery existed for a referendum. When we entered the war, it was after 226 Americans had been killed of whom 212 were travelling on foreign vessels—figures which Professor Curti does not mention. In 1919, Bryan came out in favor of the Covenant of the League of Nations but recommended some changes. Later, he advocated the cancellation of Allied debts in the interest of better international relations, pointing out that we might use the debts as a lever for limiting armaments. To the last he maintained that except in actual invasion no war should be declared except by referendum. The author dispassionately treats of Bryan's principles and failures and his contribution shows that careful, scholarly treatment which distinguishes his previous works relating to the American Peace Movement.

LUCIA AMES MEAD.

The Progressive Era

This year, dolorous with defeat and desolation, is nevertheless bright with books looking backwards to the golden age. For Mr. Claude G. Bowers (as for many others like him) the autumn of a 1928 political displeasure has ripened into the winter of a 1932 industrial discontent through which, amid the witches' Sabbath of the Hoover administration, the Four Horsemen join hands with the forces of social disorder in a mad fantastic frolic dance to the strains of the Third International. Leaving this pandemonium behind, Mr. Bowers ascends the Pisgah of historical research, from the heights of which he peers pensively back upon the Promised Land—the colorful, cheerful, equivocal little world of the 'Nineties—as desirable as it is unattainable. Nothing daunted, the Democratic seer descends from those heights, and, having taken the altitude of several major elevations meanwhile, proceeds to write a book* concerning one of them. The elevation thus signally honored happens to be the late Senator Albert Jeremiah Beveridge; and the book, minus much of Mr. Bowers' oratorical style, is a good one.

His narrative, compact and copious, has the full sweep of the progressive era, across whose rich and riotous vistas careers the life of its hero, and the lives of countless others as well. Swift, vigorous, showing in high relief that unique combination of flexible style joined to cameo-like portraiture with which Mr. Bowers always works—"Beveridge and the Progressive Era" is as good as a cinema of American liberalism in apogee and perigee. It is a series of well-remembered figures in a rapid succession of equally well-remembered events: Dolliver, Ingersoll, Blaine, in dazzling heights of youthful oratory; Bryan in his heaven-storming 1896 campaign; McKinley, Dewey, Hearst, and the entire American nation as supes in a major melodrama entitled the War with Spain; Beveridge himself in a strophaic solo on the triumph of imperialism; Upton Sinclair, Roosevelt, and the packing trust in a thrilling short subject called "The Jungle"; Taft and Roosevelt in their Humpty-Dumpty onslaught, with Roosevelt bolting the show on his Bull-Moose; the Insurgent Revolution

*"Beveridge and the Progressive Era," by Claude G. Bowers. Published by Houghton, Mifflin Company. $5.00.

of 1912 with La Follette as Danton and Taft as Louis XVI—in bewildering rapidity all these chase each other across the silversheet of Mr. Bowers' imagining.

And it is real and authentic, every bit of it, from the first scene of young Beveridge spouting speeches from an Indiana stump to the close of the cinema when the master-orator, sickened with post-war corruption and the end of all things, sits cozily in his cloistered library writing the life of John Marshall. In the orchestra are the trusts, the tariff, the railroads, the anarchists, the World War, supplying an accompaniment of more than Wagnerian proportions to this spectacle par excellence.

"Beveridge and the Progressive Era" reveals a new Bowers—one who can create historical cinemas that are not mere spectrums of party prejudice like "The Magic Era"—who can make past American history appear as actual as any now being made within the borders of our far-flung empire—and who has, in this book, built around the greatest American biographer a biography worthy to be compared with Beveridge's own.

ROBERT C. SCHALLER.

Correspondence

From Tom Mooney

Editor of UNITY:

The letter just sent to the Governor of California by fifteen famous Americans has dramatically accelerated the fight for my freedom. This new support follows the unofficial publication of the suppressed Wickersham Report on my case which was buried for more than a year by President Hoover in the vaults of the White House. This new and startling revelation of my frame-up by an official government commission should help arouse public sentiment.

No matter what the Governor of California says, the facts prove that my case is not closed. Only a small part of this proof was a gigantic Mooney meeting held November 6th, at the Civic Auditorium in San Francisco, where 18,000 Californians from all parts of this State vigorously protested my continued imprisonment and pledged to carry on the fight for my freedom.

On the basis of the facts stated in the letter I have mentioned, which tears into shreds the framed-up decision against my pardon, I have made a public demand for a new trial. This week my attorneys are taking legal steps necessary to bring me to trial on an old indictment. Originally there were eight indictments. I was tried and convicted on one; six were dismissed against my will; and one remains, at my request, on the calendar of the Superior Court of San Francisco.

It is vital that I be brought to trial and given a chance to prove my innocence. No court has ever considered the proofs secured after my conviction, that all the witnesses against me were perjurors, and that I am absolutely innocent. Dependent as I am on the support of my friends, I cannot possibly go ahead without contributions to defray the heavy expenses involved.

After seventeen years of mental and physical torture, after having stood in the shadow of the gallows, there looms through the blackness of my dungeons where I am buried alive, a ray of light, a gleam of hope. Please don't let it die. If my plans fail now, there is no telling when I will have another chance to leave here alive. There is a possibility at this time, of forcing the Courts and the Governor to act, if the aroused and aggressive mass pressure of public opinion for my pardon is crystallized immediately. The real battle is ahead of us!

I make this desperate appeal to you for immediate help. I beg of you not to fail me. Please mail your response to my Defense Committee, P. O. Box 1475, San Francisco, California.

TOM MOONEY (31921).

San Quentin Prison.

P. S. May I ask you, in order to avoid technical delays with my mail when addressed direct to me at San Quentin, to please mail your response to my Defense Committee, P. O. 1475, San Francisco?

A Friend in France

Editor of UNITY:

Will you allow a French reader to tell you how pleased she always is to read your valiant magazine, and how anxiously she is always waiting for the mail that brings it over?

It is such help to one who works for international understanding and peace, and it has often enabled me to correct wrong opinions in the minds of my compatriots, as it throws such light on many of your national problems as well as on the international outlook.

With many good wishes for the New Year and much gratitude for your splendid work, I am

Y. DECROIX.

Mont-St.-Aignan, France.

UNITY'S Value

Editor of UNITY:

We are sorry to hear of the tightness in the financial department but that is purely temporal and your eternal value is thoroughly established. At any rate we are in the same boat just now and are enclosing you $1.00 and when that is worked out will send you another and so on until the sunshine mellows existence once more.

J. W. B.

Waukegan, Illinois.

The Field

(*Continued from page* 274)

the law of non-violence, in the midst of violence let loose they were greater geniuses than Newton, greater generals than Wellington. They themselves had used arms and realized their futility; and they now taught a tired world" the tremendous effects of "non-violence in its dynamic form; which means: the conscious suffering of the whole soul, in its resistance to the will of the tyrant. A single individual," he added, "acting according to this fundamental law, could defy the whole power of an unjust empire, in order to save his honor, his religion, his soul," the soul of his people or his liberty, and *"later on would be able to bring about the fall of that empire and its regeneration."*

The fact has been put to the proof. Not against any particular state. All the European states are equally guilty of injustice and wrong-doing. A Christ has proved this, for the salvation of all mankind. But no one can be saved unless he wants to be saved. Does the world want to be saved? Will salvation be possible now, when cracks are appearing in the last dykes which still hold back the devastating flood? The world must not delude itself into thinking that it will be able to prolong the *status quo!* We must act. We must change the corrupt order, which is only upheld by iniquity. There are only two ways of inaugurating a new order: Violence and Non-Violence. Both are Revolutions. Choose between them!

Romain Rolland.

(Translation by E. Morfydd Evans.)

The New Social Creed of the Churches

The Social Creed of the churches, first formulated and adopted by the Methodists in 1908, and later adopted in the same year by the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, marked an epoch in the history of modern Christianity. This creed, so-called, was expanded and adopted anew by the Council in 1912. In 1928, a special committee was appointed "to discover anew the mind of the church in social questions." This committee, headed by Dr. Edward T. Devine, well-known sociologist, presented a new statement to the recent quadrennial meeting of the Council at Indianapolis, which was adopted as follows:

The Churches Should Stand For

"1. Practical application of the

Christian principle of social well-being to the acquisition and use of wealth, subordination of speculation and the profit motive to the creative and co-operative spirit.

"2. Social planning and control of the credit and monetary systems and the economic processes for the common good.

"3. The right of all to the opportunity for self-maintenance; a wider and fairer distribution of wealth; a living wage, as a minimum, and above this a just share for the worker in the product of industry and agriculture.

"4. Safeguarding of all workers, urban and rural, against harmful conditions of labor and occupational injury and disease.

Social Insurance Asked

"5. Social insurance against sickness, accident, want in old age and unemployment.

"6. Reduction of hours of labor as the general productivity of industry increases; release from employment at least one day in seven, with a shorter working week in prospect.

"7. Such special regulation of the conditions of work of women as shall safeguard their welfare and that of the family and the community.

"8. The right of employees and employers alike to organize for collective bargaining and social action; protection of both in the exercise of this right; the obligation of both to work for the public good; encouragement of co-operatives and other organizations among farmers and other groups.

"9. Abolition of child labor; adequate provision for the protection, education, spiritual nurture and wholesome recreation of every child.

"10. Protection of the family by the single standard of purity; educational preparation for marriage, homemaking and parenthood.

"11. Economic justice for the farmer in legislation, financing, transportation and the price of farm products as compared with the cost of machinery and other commodities which he must buy.

Rural Culture Favored

"12. Extension of the primary cultural opportunities and social services now enjoyed by urban populations to the farm family.

"13. Protection of the individual and society from the social, economic and moral waste of any traffic in intoxicants and habit-forming drugs.

"14. Application of the Christian principle of redemption to the treatment of offenders; reform of penal and correctional methods and institutions, and of criminal court procedure.

"15. Justice, opportunity and equal rights for all; mutual good will and co-operation among racial, economic and religious groups.

"16. Repudiation of war, drastic reduction of armaments, participation in international agencies for the peaceable settlement of all controversies; the building of a co-operative world order.

"17. Recognition and maintenance of the rights and responsibilities of free speech, free assembly, and a free press; the encouragement of free communication of mind with mind as essential to the discovery of truth."

Changes Made in Articles

Articles 2, 11, 12, 14, 16 and 17 are new, and the others have been considerably revised. The original statement contained sixteen articles. Article 13, in its original form, contained the words "liquor traffic," and as now stated contains the more inclusive expression "traffic in intoxicants and habit-forming drugs."

Celebrating the Anniversary of the Landing of William Penn

RESOLVED: That the Council of the Free Church of America, speaking on behalf of Universalists, Unitarians and other religious liberals of the United States and Canada, meeting in New York City on October 26, 1932, desires to send to the General Conference of Friends, the Five Years Meeting, the Yearly Meeting of Friends for Philadelphia and Vicinity and the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, its hearty felicitations upon the recent celebration of the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the landing of William Penn upon the soil of this new world which he has so richly blessed. His "holy experiment" upon the banks of the Delaware, founded on full equality, universal toleration, justice and brotherhood, is still in many ways a model of what governments must some day be. We recognize our great indebtedness to this fearless religious pioneer.

The free religious groups in whose name we speak join with Penn and with you in protesting against all imposed dogmatisms, all external, ecclesiastical authorities, all denials of religious liberty. We share with you your abiding confidence in that spiritual order which manifests itself in the silences of the soul, in that guiding light which glows within the human heart. Holding so much in common with you we crave the privilege of a closer fellowship, and a more active cooperation in ways of justice and mercy. Hopefully and eagerly we look forward to that happy day when you and we may march together, shoulder to shoulder, in the mighty ventures of faith, under the banner of love.

La Follette's
Great National Weekly Newspaper
THE PROGRESSIVE

In every issue it is fighting your battles against monopoly and organized wealth in government

SPECIAL OFFER
4 Months
— 21 — ISSUES
50c

STARTLING facts suppressed by other papers will be revealed in the next few issues. Send 50 cents today and be sure to receive the next extraordinarily interesting issues of La Follette's great weekly newspaper.
The Progressive, Dept. B., Madison, Wis.

Help India's struggle for freedom by non-violence! Help us offset British propaganda and meet Gandhi's request for moral support from America.

Join the American League for India's Freedom, John Haynes Holmes, chairman.

Tear off and return:

American League for India's Freedom
383 Bible House
New York City

Count me in as a supporter of India's struggle for independence. Here are my membership dues $.....

Name .....

Date .....Address.....

Subscribe to

The New Humanist

A Bi-Monthly Journal for Thoughtful and Selective Readers

A critical and creative journal with man-centered interests. It neither duplicates nor competes. Concise in form it appeals particularly to those seeking substantial material in new fields. Our friends are our best copy-writers:

Harry Elmer Barnes says:

"The New Humanist is the journal of the vanguard in religious progress today. Its contributors are distinguished scholars and thinkers and the subjects covered are both urgent and diversified."

And John Dewey:

"There is valuable material in this journal which I do not find elsewhere. I am confident that there is a particular audience waiting for the ideas which are set forth in it."

As well as others:

"Dignified, scientific, stimulating and suggestive—"A. Eustace Haydon. "A refreshing oasis in the desert of compromise and dishonest thought," Rabbi Solomon Goldman. "Fulfills an altogether unique function in contemporary American life," Maynard Shipley.

Per copy 20c, *Annually* $1.00

THE NEW HUMANIST
105 S. Dearborn St., Chicago, Ill.